



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Ἰδὸν το Ὀθα αἱ γὰρ ἡάρουις, αἰγυ ριόδῳαἱν αἱρ αη ὁαλαμ ὁαῖτοἱλ ὁο να ὁάοιμῃ.

LXXXII. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. VI.—No. 63.

MARCH 19, 1857.

{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.; Unstamped
Copies, 3d. each. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
What every Christian must know	25
What every Christian must do	26
The Invocation of Saints—No. II.	27
Constantinople in the Fifth Century—St. Chrysostom	29
Difficulties of Roman Catholic Editors—Mr. Justice Keogh and the Celibacy of the Clergy	31
CORRESPONDENCE :	
Mr. Power on the Worship of Saints and Angels	33
On the Jansenist Bishops of Holland—By a Catholic Layman	35
"Absolve te"—A Hymn for true Catholics	35
Farming Operations for March	35

WHAT EVERY CHRISTIAN MUST KNOW.

It happened to us once, several years ago, on a walking tour through Switzerland, that we meditated crossing a certain mountain pass, and we imagined that, with the help of our Keller's map, we should have no difficulty in finding our way. But when the landlord of the small inn where we had spent the night heard of our intended project, he raised a perfect storm of remonstrance. No one had ever heard of such a thing—there were precipices—there were snow-drifts—it was certain death to venture over the pass without a guide. Being then novices in Alpine travelling, we could not very well tell whether the threatened dangers were real or imaginary; and, having a very considerable value for our lives, we acted on our landlord's suggestion, and took the guide whom he recommended. The guide took possession of the knapsacks of the party, and marched off at our head. But, very soon, we found that the pace at which he was inclined to go was too slow for the impatience of the young and active members of our party. The guide made no objection to our pushing ahead. "Follow the path straight before you," he said, "and you cannot possibly go astray." We met with no danger from any of the precipices or snow-drifts we had heard of, though we saw nothing of our guide until he came to be paid in the evening, as we were resting ourselves after the labours of the day; and, in fact, it struck us that, except for the honour and glory of the thing, we might as well have had no guide at all. We have often profited since by the experience gained on that occasion; and when we have been told of the absolute necessity of a guide, have taken the trouble to find out whether it was that we should certainly want the guide, or only that the guide wanted us.

We have been often reminded of our Swiss guide when we compared the inducements by which the Church of Rome tempts Christians to put themselves under her guidance, with the guidance which she actually supplies to those who accept of it. The topic on which the advocates of the Church of Rome dwell most urgently is, the absolute necessity of an infallible guide. Without her help, they say, it is impossible for Christians to learn those truths which make wise unto salvation. They assert that every one will be sure to go astray who endeavours to find these truths in Scripture for himself; because that "the Scriptures contain many things difficult and hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction." And they refuse to listen to Protestants, who maintain that the difficulties or obscurities of Scripture do not concern those vital points the knowledge of which is essential to salvation, although Protestants, certainly, have the authority of many ancient Fathers to support them in their assertion. [See, for instance, St. Chrysostom:—"All things are plain and simple in the holy Scriptures; all things necessary are evident." (Hom. iii. in 2 Thess.) "The Apostles and Prophets have made everything proceeding from them plain and evident to all, in order that each person, even by himself, may be able to learn what is said from the mere reading of it." (Hom. iii. de Lazar.) And, in like manner, St. Augustine:—"God hath made the Scripture to stoop to the capacities of babes and sucklings." (Enarr. in Psal. viii.) "Scarcely anything is drawn out from the more obscure places of Scripture which is not most plainly spoken elsewhere." (De Doct. Christ. ii. 6.)] And, accordingly, when one of the early Fathers has occasion to state what are the truths which "Every Christian must know" we usually find that he contents himself with a summary of

doctrine nearly identical with that contained in the Apostles' Creed, all the articles of which are truths that lie on the very surface of Scripture, and do not require any laborious investigation of obscure texts in order to arrive at them.

Our readers can now understand the position taken up by the advocates of the Church of Rome. They say that the Church of England does not supply her members with sufficient means for the attainment of religious truth. The study of God's word; the assistance of His Spirit promised to those who seek it by prayer; the help provided by our Church in the teaching of her formularies, and of her ministers: all this is not sufficient to secure us from perplexity and error, not merely on points of speculation, but on the very essentials of our faith. Nothing less, they say, than an infallible Church can afford the necessary security.

These are the threats of precipices and snow-drifts by which timid travellers are frightened into engaging the services of a guide; but let us see how the guide does his duty.

Surely, a Roman Catholic may exclaim, you are not about to accuse our Church of any neglect in this respect. He will appeal to the many volumes containing the decisions of her councils, in which so many articles of faith have been defined, and so many heresies anathematised.

But, certainly, it cannot be said that these volumes of councils contain the things that "every Christian must know." With what face could any one maintain that the Scriptures are too difficult to be understood by the unlearned, and then send them to explore for themselves the huge folios in which the decisions of councils are recorded? Has any Roman Catholic, that is not a professed theologian, ever read the decrees of one of those councils? We should like to see one of our Roman Catholic readers catechized as to his views on any of the thorny controversies discussed at the Council of Trent—for instance, asked to explain the doctrines of Justification and Original Sin, steering clear of Lutheranism, on the one hand, and Pelagianism on the other, taking care not to give any countenance to the Jansenists, but also taking care not to fall foul of St. Augustine; and we think it likely that he would not have gone far in his statement of his doctrines before he found himself involved in some of the anathemas of which that council has been so liberal. There are, on a rough calculation, 150 doctrines condemned by it with a formal anathema. Can our readers undertake to say, that if they were asked severally their opinions on every one of these subjects, they would be sure of making, in each case, the right answer, and so escaping the authoritative censure of their Church?

To these questions it will be answered that it is most probable that an unlearned Roman Catholic would not possess the information we speak of, and that his Church does not expect that he should. The decisions of her councils are intended for the instruction of those who make theology their study, and not for that of the ordinary members of her flock. While the Church has done her duty in providing scientific theologians with a guide to any of the bye-paths of divinity which they may be tempted to explore, she does not invite the unlearned to enter into those mazes; and the great doctrines of the faith constitute the broad highway of salvation, plain, easy to be found, and in which the least learned member of the Church can walk without fear of error.

In fact, though the Church of Rome holds that faith in what she teaches is necessary to salvation, she does not hold that this faith need be an *explicit* faith. *Explicit* faith is when a person not only believes the teaching of the Church, but also knows and understands that teaching. *Implicit* faith is when a person is persuaded that what the Church teaches is all true, though he, perhaps, has a very imperfect knowledge what the doctrines of the Church really are. The best illustration of implicit faith is afforded by the well-known story of the collier, who being asked what he believed, answered, "I believe what the Church believes." Quest. "And what does the Church believe?" Ans. "The Church believes what I believe." Quest. "And what do the Church and you believe?" Ans. "We both believe the same thing."

Such faith as this is held to be sufficient for salvation. It is enough if the individual humbly receive all that is propounded to him on God's authority, and does not, in the pride of his reason, reject truths that he knows to be part of Divine revelation; but he is not to blame if he do not

hold doctrines which he has never been properly informed were part of God's revelation through the Church. Nay, he may hold two opposite doctrines—the one explicitly, the other implicitly. He may have formed his own opinion on a point of doctrine, and come to a conclusion opposite to that of the Church, but without being aware that his opinion has been condemned by the Church; and he may be, at the same time, fully desirous to believe all that the Church teaches. In this case he believes the right doctrine implicitly, and the false doctrine explicitly; and it is held that his *implicit* true faith will save him, notwithstanding his *explicit* false faith.

Roman Catholics, however, do not teach that Christians ought to be content with implicit belief on *all* points. On most subjects, indeed—such, for instance, as those decrees of the Council of Trent to which we have referred above—it is enough to be persuaded in general that the Church is in the right, without knowing exactly what her doctrines are, and all that is required is not knowingly to contradict what she teaches; but there are some of the leading truths of religion which it is a Christian's duty to *know*, as well as to believe.

From the title of this article our readers will have expected that we meant to say something about Father Furniss's book, "What every Christian must know and do," and they will probably have thought that we have been a long time in coming to our subject. This little book being intended as a manual both of faith and practice, we thought it advisable to keep the two subjects distinct, and to discuss "what every Christian must know" in this article, devoting another to the subject "what every Christian must do." The remarks which we have made enable us to distinguish both these from another question, "what every Christian must believe:" because we have seen that it is held that a Christian must believe all that the Church teaches, though he need not know it all. At the commencement of his little tract, Father Furniss gives the following summary of what every Christian must know and believe:—

"There is one God, in three Persons—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

"God the Son, Jesus Christ, was made man, and died for us."

"The good go to Heaven, and the wicked burn in Hell."

"Baptism takes from us the sin of Adam and Eve."

"Confession takes away all the sins we do ourselves."

"The Blessed Sacrament is the body and blood of Jesus Christ."

"I believe this and all that the holy Church teaches, and in this blessed faith, with God's help, I will live and die."

It will strike all readers that this list of necessary truths has, at least, the merit of brevity; and we may remark on it, in the first place, that Father Furniss would seem to have succeeded in doing what the inspired writers of the New Testament tried to do, and are said to have failed in. It was certainly the object of the writers of the New Testament to declare the truths which every Christian ought to know. St. John tells us that this was the very object of his Gospel, ch. 31., v. xx. :—"These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through His name." And yet we are required to believe that these Apostles and Evangelists, who wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, performed their task so badly that one who should have recourse to their pages for information is more likely than not to go astray, and finds nothing but perplexity and error. Strange, indeed, that inspired writers should fail in their task, but stranger still that Father Furniss, who claims no miraculous assistance, should accomplish in half a dozen lines the task in which they failed.

We wish also to discuss a little how the assertion that implicit faith is sufficient for salvation is consistent with the assertion of the necessity of an infallible guide. The argument for the necessity of an infallible guide is that there are some truths absolutely necessary for us to know, and yet so difficult to find out with any certainty that this

* He says afterwards every Christian must know, at least—I. The four great truths of faith. II. The Sacraments—at least Baptism, Penance, and the Blessed Sacrament. III. The prayers Our Father, Hail Mary, and the Creed. IV. The Commandments of God and of the Church. The first two heads are included in the summary given above—the latter rather belong to the subject what every Christian must do.

assistance is absolutely indispensable to us. Well, we are induced by these arguments to engage the services of this infallible guide, and then we are told that it is not necessary for us to know these difficult doctrines at all, and that it is enough if we are persuaded of the trustworthiness of our guide.

Why, the story with which we commenced hardly fully represents the state of the case. In that story our guide took our money, and then left us to find the way for ourselves. In this case the guide says that all we have to do is to pay him his fee, take him for our guide, and be fully persuaded of his efficiency, but that our making the journey is wholly unnecessary, or, at least, if we do make the journey, it is not that we have a guide to tell us at each moment of doubt what path to choose and what turn to take, but that we are to put ourselves into a close carriage, and be carried along with the windows shut, persuaded that we are going right, but without the least knowledge where or how we have been driven.

It is worth remarking also that the "four great truths of faith, which nobody can go to Heaven without knowing," are every one of them taught as distinctly by the Church of England as by the Church of Rome. These truths are contained in the answers to the following questions:—

- "1. How many Gods are there? *One God.*
- "2. How many Persons are there in one God? *Three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*
- "3. Which of them took a body and soul, and died on the Cross for our sins? *God the Son, Jesus Christ, took body and soul, and died on the Cross for our sins.*
- "4. What will God do to the good? *He will make them happy for ever in Heaven.* And what to the wicked? *He will burn them for ever in Hell.*"

All these doctrines are taught just as plainly by the Church of England as by the Church of Rome; and if, then, a member of the Church of England be enticed by the promise of an infallible guide in his perplexity to join the Romish communion, he finds that his guide's directions with regard to the necessary points of faith come just to this—go on believing as you believed already. This is much the same as our Swiss guide's direction—follow on the path-right before you.

Again, we have to remark that in this attempt to enumerate the truths which every Christian must know, the advocates of Romanism adopt the very same principle which they assail when put forward by Protestants. When it is objected to Protestants that there are difficulties in the Bible, they answer that these difficulties do not obscure those points that are necessary to salvation, and that the great highway to salvation is plain, and broad, and easily found, although there may be difficulty and perplexity in tracing out some of those bye-paths that our curiosity leads us to wish to explore. Roman Catholic controversialists, on the other hand, have denied that there is any such distinction of fundamental and non-fundamental truths. They say it is our duty to believe *everything* that God has revealed; and that, whether the matter be great or small, the sin of rejecting a revelation from God is in all cases the same. And, certainly, if any man *knows* any doctrine to be revealed by God, and yet refuses to believe it, his sin is great, whether the place that doctrine holds in the economy of grace be high or low. But it is not very likely that any one can believe God to be incapable of falsehood or deceit, and yet refuse to believe a revelation which he knows to come from God. We may take for granted that men in general will believe what they know to be revealed from God, and the only question is, what are they bound to *know* and to believe explicitly? When Roman Catholics come to explain themselves, they are forced to confess that they cannot assert it to be necessary to salvation that every man shall believe explicitly *everything* that can be deduced from Scripture. On the other hand, we see that some doctrines are taught there so plainly that the denial of them by an individual of ordinary knowledge and capacity will argue some culpable carelessness or prejudice on his part. Protestants think that they are safe in assuming that whatever God has made absolutely necessary for the salvation of men in general He has revealed with sufficient clearness to be understood by men in general; and they see that some things are so plainly revealed that no unprejudiced man of common understanding can miss seeing them. These are what they mean by fundamental truths, and their belief that there are such truths must be shared by any one who attempts, as Father Furniss does, to make an enumeration of truths that every Christian must know.

Now that we have shown how much of Protestant principle there is in the very conception of Mr. Furniss's attempt, it will appear what injustice and untruth there is in Dr. Milner's assertion that it is impossible for Protestants to make an act of faith. We copy the following "Act of Faith" from the first edition of Mr. Furniss's book. We do not know why it is left out in the second, seeing that one may gain by saying it an indulgence of seven years and seven times forty days, which may be given to the souls in Purgatory:—

"O my God, because what you say is most true, and you have said it, I believe that you are one God in three Persons—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. I believe that God the Son, Jesus Christ, took a body and soul, and died on the Cross for our sins. I believe that you will make the good happy for ever in Heaven, and burn the wicked for ever in Hell. I believe all that the

Catholic Church teaches, and in this belief, with God's help, I will live and die."

Thus it will be seen that the act of faith consists of a profession of *explicit* belief in the "four great truths of faith," and of *implicit* belief in all the Church teaches. But substitute the one word Bible for Church, and the Protestant will make the same confession with all his heart. He will profess his explicit belief in the same four great truths of faith, and his implicit belief in all the Bible teaches.

This being the case, we ask Roman Catholics to judge whether the condition of Protestants is so unsafe as they are apt to imagine, and whether the necessity of an infallible guide is as great as has been pretended? In fact, it is evident that an infallible guide is necessary only as far as *explicit* knowledge is necessary. If our readiness to receive all that God has revealed *without knowing* it is enough for our salvation, then there is an end at once to the pretence that it was necessary for the salvation of the world that God should provide them with an infallible guide to make them know the truth. Why may not Protestants be saved by their implicit faith in the Bible as well as Roman Catholics by their implicit faith in the Church? Take the case of a Roman Catholic earnestly desirous not to contradict anything that his Church teaches, though he has not taken the trouble to form any opinion at all upon a number of points on which she declares "that error is damnable, and although there may be some points on which he is wrongly informed as to her teaching. In such a case, it is held that his false belief will not injure one who did not wilfully reject anything that he knew the Church to have taught. And why may not a Protestant be saved in like manner who is sincerely and earnestly desirous to believe everything that God has revealed in the Scriptures, and who has learned from the Scriptures the "four great truths of faith," and many other of those truths that make wise unto salvation, even though there may be some points on which he has wrongly interpreted the teaching of the Scriptures? Have we not as good a right in this case as in the other to say that his false belief will not be fatal to one who is, notwithstanding, of an humble, teachable disposition, and who does not wilfully reject anything that he knows God to have revealed?

What Roman Catholics ask us to believe is, that implicit faith in the Church is sufficient to save us, but that implicit faith in God is not. In other words, we are not safe if we build our house on the Rock, and we are safe if we build it on the sand. Roman Catholics who acknowledge the Bible to be a revelation from God must own that Protestants are on firm ground, when they place their full belief in everything that God has revealed through the Scriptures. But can they say that they are on equally firm ground when they teach for doctrines the commandments of men? We ask those Roman Catholics who believe it to be wholly impossible that their Church and their priests can ever lead them astray to consider well what we have to say in our next article.

WHAT EVERY CHRISTIAN MUST DO.

It is exactly a year since, in our number for March 1856, our attention was first called by a correspondent, who signed himself "Enoch Heli," to the little book circulated by the Redemptorist Fathers, and which then bore the title "What every Christian must know." The book must have had a large sale, since Protestants and Roman Catholics, each for their own reasons, have vied with each other in circulating it; and, on its coming to a new edition, the author perceiving that it was much more of a guide to practice than to faith, changed the title to "What every Christian must know and do." We have thought it advisable to discuss the two subjects in separate articles; and having made some remarks on Father Furniss's attempt to enumerate the things which every Christian must know, we proceed now to examine his account of "What every Christian must do."

But those who have read our article on this book in our January number will be disposed to think that the title ought to have been, not "What every Christian must do," but, "What every Christian may do." Rules of conduct which sound very well are accompanied by exceptions or limitations, affording much convenient license to any persons in want of a flexible code of morality. Thus, we must not strike our parents, or put out our tongue at them, or mock them—in their presence; we must not curse them, or call them such very bad names as fools, or beasts, or drunkards—in their hearing. We must not break an oath; but it is not an oath, if when we said the words, we did not mean to take an oath. We must not do any servile work on the Lord's Day; but it is not servile work to write, or teach, or draw, and to be paid for doing it. Nor is it a mortal sin to do servile work without necessity for less than two hours, or two hours and a-half. We must not do any great bodily injury to others; but it is not a sin to desire some temporal misfortune to another, in order that it may make him cease to give scandal, or be converted, or not persecute the good. Tailors must not cabbage any of the cloth entrusted to them,

a Father Furniss appears to be very much of the opinion of the Abbot of Wignome, who maintained that the Christian religion only obliged him to love his enemies' souls; but that he did not feel himself in any way bound to love their bodies. (See *Friedrich's Researches in the Record Office*, Fraser's Magazine, Feb., 1857.)

unless there is a common custom of doing it, or unless it be necessary in order to gain a reasonable profit. Neither must shopkeepers adulterate what they sell, by mixing water, for instance, with any liquor, unless there is a common custom of doing it, or unless it be necessary in order to gain a reasonable profit.

These are only some specimens of Father Furniss's opinions as to what a Christian may do; and if our only object were to amuse our readers with these exhibitions of eccentric morality, we should go on to give them some specimens of his notions as to some of the things which a Christian may not do; but we feel that we have said enough for our purpose. We shall not insult our readers by discussing the question whether the code of morality here taught is one fit to be put forward by Christian teachers. We can imagine excuses made for some few of these points of moral teaching, or can conceive attempts made to show that they are capable of a good sense; but every one whose own moral feelings are not completely blunted, must allow that this teaching, when understood in its most obvious sense, is bad teaching; and that if the poor people, among whom it is circulated at the price of one halfpenny, follow its advice in the sense which they are sure to put upon it, it is calculated to produce, or to perpetuate, among them a very low standard of morals.

Therefore, without wasting more words on the question whether the morality of this tract is pure and Christian morality, we pass at once to the question—is it the moral teaching of the Church of Rome? If Father Furniss alone were responsible for the doctrines of his book, we should not waste powder and shot upon him. We do not wish to make a Church responsible for the faults of an individual; nor should we blame the Roman Catholic Church because one of her priests has published a book of lax morality, unless it can be made to appear that that morality is the morality of his Church.

Father Furniss distinctly puts forward that he is not the author of his code of morality, which he professes to have only compiled from the works of St. Alphonsus Liguori; and we can bear testimony that the defence is a just one; that Father Furniss has said nothing for which he cannot produce the authority of this canonized saint; but, on the other hand, that if he had not omitted or softened many things which are to be found in Liguori, he would have made his work still more unfit for general circulation than it is.

We had ourselves made the morality of St. Liguori the subject of several articles in this periodical (see our numbers from May to September, 1855), and had endeavoured to persuade our Roman Catholic friends to ask themselves how it came to pass that the morality taught by St. Liguori, who can claim to be the most trustworthy and authoritative exponent of Roman Catholic teaching on this subject, should be so far below the morality taught and practised by heretic English gentlemen. The line of argument adopted by Roman Catholic defenders of Liguori was, that we were casting in their teeth musty Latin volumes which were not in the hands of the people, and of which not one Roman Catholic in fifty knew anything. In an article in the *Dublin Review* (Oct., 1851), apparently written by Cardinal Wiseman, this defence is made:—

"The work of the saint, from its nature, is one which is little likely to fall into the hands of ordinary readers, and still less likely to be understood by them. Even the Catholic laity, to say nothing of the Protestant, have no access to the work of St. Alphonsus, for they are far too well instructed in their duty to exercise an idle, and it may even be a vicious, curiosity upon a subject with which, as a body, they have no concern."

At that time we thought it enough to reply, that though the Roman Catholic might have no direct knowledge with St. Liguori's work, still they could not help becoming very well acquainted with it indirectly. St. Liguori is the most approved guide for Roman Catholic confessors, and if the Saint has, in any one case, pronounced that to be innocent which Gospel morality condemns, the error does not remain a speculative one, but leads to practical consequences. "In thousands of confessional the uneasy scruples of penitents are lulled to rest with the assurance that the act which has caused them remorse has been pronounced on sufficient authority to be no sin at all. The penitents, with disordered consciences, go their way; they have no fear of committing the same act again themselves, and if they are tolerably good natured, will take care, too, to enlighten any of their friends who may not be so well informed as themselves. And so the whole public opinion of Roman Catholic countries is infected, and the morality of Liguori supplants the morality of the Gospel."

This was the account which we gave of the way in which the moral teaching of Liguori might become familiar to thousands who had never seen in print a line professing to be taken from his works. But now there is an end to all dispute. When abridgments of Liguori's moral teaching are circulated by thousands among the people, and with the highest sanction of the heads of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, it can no longer be considered a mere speculative question whether his morality be sound or not.

It is worth while to notice another distinction by which the writer of the article in the *Dublin Review*, already referred to, endeavoured to defend the laxity of